

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 170 497

CE 020 214

AUTHOR Hamilton, Jack A.
TITLE How to Get JDRP Approval of Career Education Activities.
INSTITUTION American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, Palo Alto, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Career Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D. C.
PUB DATE Apr 79
CONTRACT 300-77-0303
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, (Las Vegas, Nevada, April 1979); For related documents see CE 020 215 and CE 020 220-224

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; Demonstration Programs; *Evaluation Methods; Evaluation Needs; Failure Factors; Federal Aid; *Information Dissemination; Program Descriptions; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Program Proposals; Success Factors; *Validated Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Joint Dissemination Review Panel

ABSTRACT

The Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) was established in 1972 by the Education Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to review projects that seek federal funding for nationwide dissemination. Since very few career education programs have been represented among the exemplary programs approved by JDRP, a project was undertaken to find well-evaluated activities that could be submitted for JDRP approval and to describe the activities that received approval so that they could serve as models for designing future local program evaluations. Ten career education activities were recommended for JDRP's consideration after a comprehensive national search (see CE 020 215), and seven projects were subsequently approved for dissemination. (See CE 020 220-224, CE 020 233 for the individual JDRP submissions of these programs.) Detailed activity descriptions were then prepared for each of these activities to permit its replication or adaptation elsewhere. Because so few career education programs met the criteria of JDRP for evidence of effectiveness, it was recommended that local career education programs expand and upgrade their evaluation efforts by using (1) moneys from the Career Education Incentive Act to fund evaluations, (2) previously tested evaluation models, and (3) technical assistance at the time of proposal writing so that the evaluation design can be reviewed by experts. (Appendix A gives project overviews for the seven JDRP-approved career education activities.) (ELG)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *



AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH
IN THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

P.O. Box 1113, 1791 Arastradero Rd., Palo Alto, Ca. 94302 • 415/493-3550

How To Get JDRP Approval
of
Career Education Activities

Jack A. Hamilton

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Personnel
and Guidance Association, Las Vegas, April 1979.

ED170497

CE 030 314

Very few career education programs have been represented among the exemplary educational programs developed by local school districts and approved by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP). Are good programs really lacking, or are there simply too many problems inherent in evaluating a developing area such as career education? We know, for example, that one problem has been the application of standard evaluation designs to measure the effectiveness of a multitude of locally developed career education activities. Another problem has been the difficulty in finding within schools or districts with career education programs, comparison groups that have not been exposed to at least some career education concepts. In addition, valid and reliable instruments to measure career education outcomes have not been readily available. Although these problems do exist, there very likely are programs that have overcome such problems but have not been identified.

In 1977, the U.S. Office of Education contracted with the American Institutes for Research (AIR) to examine the effectiveness of career education by identifying the "best of the current career education programs and practices" (Public Law 93-380).¹ Given the wide variety of locally developed career education activities,² it was recognized that several

¹The work described in this paper was carried out by the American Institutes for Research under Contract No. 300-77-0303 awarded by the U.S. Office of Education/DHEW. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent U.S. Office of Education position or policy.

²The term "activities" was used throughout the study for all efforts in career education including such diverse operations as a high school placement program, infusion of career education concepts into the K-6 curriculum, a project that brings community members into the schools to discuss their jobs, or a guidance program for grades 8 through 12.

different approaches in evaluation were required to determine effectiveness. However, if some activities could be identified as well-evaluated and ultimately approved for dissemination, they could serve as guides for school districts seeking to adopt or adapt effective career education activities.

The purposes of this paper are to: (1) describe AIR's attempts to obtain approval from the JDRP to disseminate information about career education activities demonstrated to be effective; (2) furnish summary descriptions of the seven activities ultimately approved by the JDRP; and (3) discuss implications for local program evaluations.

Joint Dissemination Review Panel

The Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) was established in 1972 by the Education Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Panel has 22 members, eleven staff from the U.S. Office of Education and the same number from the National Institute of Education, appointed respectively by the Commission of Education and the Director of NIE. Panelists are selected on the basis of their ability to analyze and understand evidence of effectiveness furnished by local program evaluation data. To ensure that panel procedures are fair, panelists are expected to base their decisions on personally unbiased and methodologically sound judgments (Evans, 1978a).

As described by the Ideabook (Tallmadge, 1977), JDRP review seeks to set standards of effectiveness and documentation for educational products and programs. Before Education Division support can be provided for dissemination, suitable evidence must be provided to convince the

Panel members that each of these criteria has been met or exceeded:

- The intended positive effects of the product or program were achieved, without appreciable negative side effects.
- The positive effects were measured reliably and validly and the obtained measurements were not explainable by chance.
- There is tangible evidence that the product or program actually caused the measured effects.
- The magnitude of the measured effects is educationally significant.
- The available evidence is presented in a thorough, easily interpretable, and plausible manner.
- There is a reasonable chance that the positive effects can be reproduced elsewhere.

Submissions are made directly to the JDRP by NIE and USOE program offices, which are responsible for identifying potentially exemplary projects. Once identified, all projects must be reviewed by the program office for social fairness, factual accuracy, and evidence of effectiveness. As soon as at least three submissions have been forwarded, a quorum of nine members is convened by the Administrative Officer of the Panel, with at least four NIE members and four USOE members represented. Approximately 45 minutes are devoted to the review of each submission; a vote is taken immediately following each review with approval determined by a simple majority. Only after this review process and a positive endorsement by a majority of the Panel members present can a specific project be approved for nationwide dissemination with federal funding support.

As of October 1978, 366 local projects had submitted applications seeking JDRP approval. Approximately 57 percent (207 projects) passed.¹

¹ If a program does not pass but the presented evidence is substantial (though less than adequate), the JDRP may suggest another submission at a later time.

Of the projects that passed, 129 are receiving dissemination funds as Developer/Demonstrators under contract with USOE's Division of Educational Replication. The major responsibility of Developer/Demonstrators is to secure the adoption of their programs in other states. At least 50 percent of the adoptions they obtain annually must occur in a state other than their own.

Preparation of Career Education Activity Submissions

After a nationwide search, ten career education activities were recommended for the JDRP's consideration by AIR staff and the USOE Project Officer. Detailed accounts of the search and screening process to arrive at these ten potentially exemplary activities are available elsewhere (Hamilton & Mitchell, 1978; Hamilton, Baker, & Mitchell, in press). Based on review of activity evaluation reports and other documents, telephone discussions with activity directors, on-site consultation with activity staff, and direct observations of activity components, evaluation descriptions of each activity were prepared by AIR staff according to a designated format (Tallmadge, 1977). In several instances, re-analyses of data were carried out by AIR staff.

In the first section of the submission, key strategies that appeared to contribute to the outstanding gains of participants were described. While the Panel looked primarily at the evidence of effectiveness presented in the second half of the submission, the description of the activity had to be detailed enough for the Panel to readily determine which features of the activity produced the impact. The second section presented evaluation evidence supporting the claim of activity effectiveness, including:

- (1) Information on the characteristics of activity and comparison groups;

(2) identification of instruments used to measure achievement or attitudes; and (3) results and interpretation of data analyses.

Draft versions of the ten submissions were forwarded to the USOE Project Officer for review and circulation to Office of Career Education staff members for their reactions. AIR staff received recommendations for revisions that might clarify the information presented. Final versions of the activity evaluation summaries were submitted by the USOE Project Officer to Office of Career Education staff, to other USOE programs that had provided developmental funding, and finally to the JDRP Administrative Officer. The ten submissions are listed below by activity title and location:

<u>Activity Title</u>	<u>Location</u>
Career Development Program	Akron, Ohio
Developmental Career Guidance Project	Pima County, Arizona
EPIC, Inc.	Fort Lauderdale, Florida
Fostering a Team Approach to Career Education	Prince George's County, Maryland
Project CAP	Greenland, Arkansas
Project CDCC	Coloma, Michigan
Project CERES	Ceres, California
Project EPIC	Louisville, Kentucky
Project Equality	Seattle, Washington
Project MATCH	Ontario, California

Outcomes of the JDRP Review

Six of the ten activities submitted were approved for national dissemination. These six were: (1) the Akron Career Development Program; (2) Project CAP; (3) Project CDCC; (4) Project CERES; (5) Project Equality; and

(6) Project MATCH. The director of a seventh activity (the Developmental Career Guidance Project) was strongly urged by the Panel to submit a second application with additional data concerning several teacher and student variables. Such data would allow the panelists to determine whether these variables were correlated with the treatment variable. If not, the panelists could consider the exclusive relationship of the treatment to student scores on the activity criterion measures. A subsequent search of the school files by the project director showed that these data did exist. They were included in tables, and the revised evaluation summary was submitted and approved after the JDRP's second review.

The Panel strongly encouraged the directors of two of the three unapproved activities to reapply. Before doing so, however, the directors were urged to obtain stronger evidence of activity effectiveness by using an evaluation design that permitted unequivocal conclusions regarding impact of project activities on target students. In summary, seven of the ten career education activities were approved for dissemination and authorized to apply for federal funding support,¹ and two of the remaining three activities were viewed as having strong potential for approval if more conclusive evidence of activity impact were provided.

Detailed Activity Descriptions

For each of the seven exemplary activities approved for dissemination, descriptions were expanded to include information that would permit replication or adaptation of the activity.² The outline for writing descriptions consisted of eight major headings with several subtopics under

¹See Appendix A for summaries of each of the seven approved activities.

²Similar descriptions were prepared for the activities that did not receive JDRP approval; however, claims of effectiveness were not included in these.

each. These eight segments are summarized below.

In the one-page Project Overview section, the reader is introduced to the activity through brief descriptions of its various aspects. Those facets of the activity highlighted include: (1) Title and Location; (2) Type (e.g., infusion); (3) Project Director's Name; (4) Setting; (5) Staff; (6) Goals; (7) Evaluation Design; (8) Materials; and (9) Cost. The Program Development section describes the reasons why the activity began, its goals, its relationship to the local school system, and aspects of the community that influenced planning of the activity. If applicable, it also identifies persons who were instrumental during the planning phase and how the activity changed since it began. The Materials and Activities segment details how the career education activities are implemented both inside and outside the classroom and includes teaching techniques, curricular sequencing, assessment of student achievement, facilities, and materials and equipment used.

In the Parent and Community Involvement section, the key roles of outside-school groups in the career education activities are discussed. Project staff are described in the Staffing and Management section, including descriptions of their qualifications, responsibilities, and recruitment procedures. Additional information is presented on activity management policies and inservice training activities. In the Costs section, budget information is provided, with special attention given to start-up expenses, continuation costs, and the per-student cost of the career education activity.

The Evidence of Effectiveness segment summarizes the evidence of activity effectiveness which had been prepared in greater detail for AIR's

submission to the JDRP. A Conclusion capsules the merits of the project, registers any necessary caveats, and summarizes the prospects for replicating the project in other settings. Appendices include the major documents needed by school districts interested in adopting the activities.

Following the drafting and editing by AIR project staff, activity descriptions were reviewed by the local staff of the various sites. Their suggestions for changes were incorporated into the descriptions which were then submitted to the USOE Project Officer.¹

Implications for Local Career Educators

A key finding of this national search for exemplary programs is that the probability of finding career education projects with acceptable evidence of effectiveness is very small, and that this poses a serious obstacle to the dissemination of career education activities (Hamilton & Mitchell, in press). One alternative would be for the JDRP to establish a second level of acceptability, such as "promising practices." However, the JDRP Chairperson is reportedly concerned that the meaning and clarity of different levels of approval would become blurred, with the result that everything approved by the JDRP at whatever level would be seen as essentially similar (Evans, 1978b). The distinction between "promising" and "supported by evidence of effectiveness" would quickly be lost. Present U.S. Office of Education policy encourages the distribution of descriptive catalogs and listings of projects and materials of unknown effectiveness only if claims or laudatory statements are avoided. This policy is aimed at safeguarding the right of potential adopters to expect that programs

¹These activity descriptions are being published by USOE in a volume entitled Career Education Programs That Work. To obtain a copy, write to Dr. Sidney C. High, Office of Career Education, USOE/DHEW, ROB #3, Room 3108A, 7th and D Streets, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

recommended by the federal government have something substantial supporting them in the way of evidence of effectiveness.

A more creative alternative is to expand, upgrade, and support local career education program evaluations. Here are some specific recommendations:

1. *Since some of the best career education programs do not have opportunities to go through the JDRP review because funding provisions for planning and implementing outcome evaluations are lacking, the level of effort that goes into planning appropriate designs for evaluating instructional programs and products in career education should be increased.*

The Career Education Incentive Act (U.S. Congress, 1977) recognizes the need for adequate program evaluations. The Incentive Act requires that annual state plans "provide proposed criteria to the Commissioner for the evaluation of the extent to which the State will achieve the objectives set out in the State plan." Although the Incentive Act does not require specific funds to be set aside for the support of local school system personnel who would be responsible for evaluation planning and implementation, it does specify that federal funds be used to "provide State leadership for career education, either directly or through arrangements with public agencies and private organizations (including institutions of higher education), in ... conducting needs assessments and evaluations." Clearly, the State plan mechanism should be used to assure that a sufficient level of effort is applied to evaluation of career education activities supported with Incentive Act funds.

2. *There are probably many more highly effective career education programs than those few that have passed the JDRP. To provide local career educators with some tools to carry out evaluations acceptable to the JDRP, a few generic career education evaluation models should be field tested with actual career education activities.*

One of the products of the study discussed in this paper is an evaluation handbook (Mitchell, 1978) that was developed to encourage local

career educators to apply sound evaluation models to their efforts.¹ The handbook contains models for evaluating: (1) curriculum infusion; (2) staff development; (3) product development; (4) facilities; (5) supplementary activities; and (6) indirect interventions. Each model includes the steps necessary to avoid those problems that AIR found characterized local evaluations of similar activities. By focusing on ways to avoid the problems, the writers hoped to encourage local practitioners to adopt or adapt applicable models to evaluate their career education activities. Local career educators are urged to build one of the evaluation models into future project proposals, and to report to the Office of Career Education their experiences in field testing the models.

3. Technical assistance should be made available to local career educators at the time of proposal writing so that an evaluation design reviewed by experts can be included in their proposals.

If an appropriate evaluation design is not a part of the original project proposal, it is unlikely that necessary evaluation planning and implementation will be carried out once the project is funded. Such technical assistance could be supported by either local or state agencies that solicit career education proposals, or possibly by technical assistance clearinghouses maintained by the National Diffusion Network (NDN). One such clearinghouse is the Technical Assistance Brokerage (TAB) consisting of five regional service units that match those providing technical services with NDN funded projects needing the services. Recently, TAB has been authorized to expand its role by coordinating the furnishing of technical assistance to any local project seeking to collect evaluation data that will be acceptable to the JDRP.

¹Under a USOE-approved publishing agreement, Olympus Publishing Co. of Salt Lake City, Utah is distributing this handbook.

References

- Evans, J.W. Current JDRP Chairperson, personal correspondence, June 9, 1978(a).
- Evans, J.W. Current JDRP Chairperson, personal correspondence, December 18, 1978(b).
- Hamilton, J.A., & Mitchell, A.M. Identification of evaluated, exemplary activities in career education (K-12). Final Report AIR-66700-7/78-FR. Palo Alto, Ca.: American Institutes for Research, 1978.
- Hamilton, J.A., Baker, O.V., & Mitchell, A.M. Identifying well-evaluated activities in career education. Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, in press.
- Hamilton, J.A., & Mitchell, A.M. How to improve career education evaluation. Journal of Career Education, in press.
- Mitchell, A.M. (Ed.). Ways to evaluate different types of career education activities: A handbook of evaluation models. Technical Report AIR-66700-7/78-TR3. Palo Alto, Ca.: American Institutes for Research, 1978.
- Tallmadge, G.K. The Joint Dissemination Review Panel: Ideabook. Washington, D.C.: NIE/DHEW, September 1977.
- U.S. Congress. Public Law 95-207, career education incentive act. 95th Congress, December 13, 1977.

APPENDIX A

Summaries of the Seven Approved Career Education Activities

PROJECT OVERVIEW

- TITLE & LOCATION: Career Development Program
Office of Career Education Programs
65 Steiner Avenue
Akron, Ohio 44301
- TYPE: Infusion
- PROJECT DIRECTOR: Nicholas J. Topougis
Ph: (216) 434-3404
- SETTING: This project focuses on students in grades K-10 and offers some services to students in grades 11 and 12 as well. The district contains 47 elementary schools, 10 junior high schools, and nine senior high schools, serving about 50,000 students in a total population of over 275,000. The student population served in 1975-76 consisted of approximately equal numbers of white and non-white students. Akron is a mostly urbanized area with manufacturing, particularly of rubber products, as its major type of employment.
- STAFF: One full-time director coordinates the efforts of four elementary level career coordinators and four secondary level career coordinators. A full-time secretary and three part-time para-professionals complete the staff.
- GOALS: The goals of Akron's Career Development Program are to increase students' self-awareness and self-esteem, knowledge of the world of work, and skills in decision-making. Seven areas of objectives have been developed based on these goals: the self; the individual and the environment; education and training; the world of work; economics; employability and work adjustment; and decision-making.
- EVALUATION DESIGN: Equal numbers of randomly selected program and non-program students were selected in the spring of 1976 for testing on a posttest-only basis. Program students' performance was compared with that of non-program students.
- MATERIALS: Available for dissemination are: (1) Flight Plan: Toward a Career Choice -- School-Community Collaboration, an implementation manual; (2) curriculum guides for the K-6 levels; and (3) other selected materials.
- COST: The major program costs are the director's, career coordinators', and secretary's salaries.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

- TITLE & LOCATION: Pima County Developmental Career Guidance Project
545 North Camino Seco
Tucson, Arizona 85710
- TYPE: Infusion
- PROJECT DIRECTOR: Joyce McKay
Ph: (602) 296-2397
- SETTING: Pima County is a large and extremely diverse segment of southern Arizona, encompassing a major city (Tucson), vacant and agricultural lands, and Indian reservation lands. The overall county population is approximately 80% white and 20% Mexican-American, American Indian, and other minorities. Most white families live within the city and are employed in manufacturing and other occupations. Most minority families live in the more rural areas and are employed in agricultural and related occupations. The county's 155 schools serve over 90,000 students.
- STAFF: The project staff consists of approximately 50 people, including a project director, about 30 guidance specialists, and specialists in other fields, plus support staff.
- GOAL: The ultimate goal of this project is to help all K-12 students in the county grow in the areas of self awareness, educational awareness, career awareness, economic awareness, decision making, beginning competency, employability skills, and appreciations and attitudes.
- EVALUATION DESIGN: The impact of this project on student growth was assessed in 1974-75 by testing comparable groups of treatment and control students on a posttest only basis. The grades tested were 4-12.
- MATERIALS: Materials used in this project consist of an extensive library of career education resources. A series of 24 instructional units developed by the state of Arizona is used, together with a collection of commercially developed media and materials. This collection is continually updated by the project's Media Review Committee.
- COSTS: The major project costs are staff salaries and the procurement of media and materials.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

- TITLE & LOCATION: Project CAP (Career Awareness Program)
Boston Mountains Educational Cooperative for Federal Programs
Box 13
Greenland, Arkansas 72737
- TYPE: Infusion
- PROJECT DIRECTOR: Jeanne Leffler
Ph: (501) 443-3336
- SETTING: This project serves students in grades K-6. In 1976-77, the project was implemented in six of the eight schools comprising the Boston Mountains Educational Cooperative headquartered in Prairie Grove, Arkansas. The cooperative is a consortium of eight school districts in a rural, mountainous area of north-west Arkansas. The estimated population in the geographic area served is 16,000 persons with a school enrollment of 5,100. Ninety percent of the population is from rural farm families; the remaining 10% are considered rural non-farming families. The project is presently functioning in 19 schools under a statewide dissemination program funded by ESEA Title IVC funds and funds from the State Department of Education.
- STAFF: The Project CAP staff consists of a half-time project director, two curriculum coordinators, a bookkeeper-secretary, and a machine operator.
- GOALS: The goals of Project CAP are to provide awareness of adult occupations among K-8 level students, along with regular instruction in basic academic areas. Special emphasis is placed on showing students that the studying they are doing in school is important and related to work they will encounter outside of school.
- EVALUATION DESIGN: The impact upon students of Project CAP activities implemented in 1976-77 was assessed by testing comparable groups of treatment and control students in February and March 1977.
- MATERIALS: Project CAP uses staff-developed Learning Activity Packets (LAPs) and other materials. At each grade level, two packets in each of 15 USOE occupational clusters plus two packets on self-awareness were developed, for a total of 32 packets at each level. The packets are sequential and blend easily into the regular curriculum, with career stories and academic skills infused into the appropriate regular lesson without requiring additional time.
- COST: The main cost items are 32 Project CAP LAPs for each student at each grade level; a teacher's manual at each grade level; and evaluation instruments. Potential additional costs include teachers' time spent in a pre-school year inservice training workshop.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

- TITLE & LOCATION: Project CDCC (Career Development Centered Curriculum)
Coloma Community School District
P.O. Box 215
Coloma, Michigan 49038
- TYPE: Add-on via career education units
- PROJECT DIRECTOR: Lee Downey
Ph: (616) 468-8341
- SETTING: This project serves students in grades K-6. In 1975-76, the project was implemented in the district's three elementary schools. Coloma is a rural community in southwest Michigan. The estimated population in the area served is 12,000 persons, with 1,600 students enrolled in grades K-6 each year. A large segment of the parents is employed in business and industries related to agriculture. The project is currently being replicated at other locations throughout the state of Michigan under a statewide dissemination program funded by an ESEA Title IV-C Grant.
- STAFF: During the four-year development and field testing period, Project CDCC staff consisted of a project director and two project coordinators. An evaluator was hired on a contract basis.
- GOAL: The goal of Project CDCC is to provide career development instruction to rural students at the elementary level (K-6). This instruction is designed especially to increase students' awareness of life roles, to help them formulate realistic self concepts, and to foster the development and use of decision-making skills.
- EVALUATION DESIGN: The impact of Project CDCC activities upon students was assessed in 1975-76 by testing comparable groups of treatment and control students at the beginning and again at the end of each instructional unit.
- MATERIALS: The project has developed a comprehensive, articulated career development curriculum for K-6 students. The 27 units (four for each of grades K-5 and three at the sixth-grade level) include learning and practice in math, communication arts, science, and social studies; they also convey the career development aspects of an individual's growth. Teachers are also encouraged to use a few commercial materials.
- COST: The main cost items are teachers' time spent in teacher training (a two-day inservice training session) and the Project CDCC units for each grade level.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

- TITLE & LOCATION: Project CERES (Career Education Responsive to Every Student)
Ceres Unified School District
P.O. Box 307
Ceres, California 95307
- TYPE: Infusion
- PROJECT COORDINATOR: Virginia Lish
Ph: (209) 538-0148
- SETTING: In 1972-76, the project was implemented throughout the district's schools in grades K-12, with funding from a Vocational Education Part D grant and a grant from the U.S. Office of Career Education. The school district is located in Stanislaus County, which lies in the heart of the Central Valley of California. It serves approximately 4,200 students from a rural, small-town community of about 12,000.
- STAFF: During the four-year development and field testing period, Project CERES staff consisted of a project director, a part-time curriculum coordinator, an evaluation consultant, and a secretary.
- GOALS: The project has the dual goals of infusing career education concepts into the elementary and secondary curriculum and of developing an articulated curriculum that provides for student attainment of career education goals.
- EVALUATION DESIGN: The impact of Project CERES activities on students was evaluated in 1973-74 by utilizing a pre-post treatment and control group design.
- MATERIALS: The project has emphasized not only the development of curriculum models and objectives for career education but also the production of materials to implement or provide for the teaching of the curriculum. Over 100 Learning Activity Packages and other materials have been developed and field-tested.
- COST: The main cost items are teachers' time spent in teacher training, consultant assistance, a part-time project staff coordinator, and student materials.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

- TITLE & LOCATION: Project Equality
Highline Public Schools
Educational Resources and Administrative Center
15675 Ambaum Blvd., SW
Seattle, Washington 98166
- TYPE: Infusion
- PROJECT DIRECTOR: John D. Ross
Ph: (206) 433-2454
- SETTING: Project Equality's home site was the Highline School District near Seattle, Washington where it has been in operation for six years. Field testing was conducted in two neighboring districts, Northshore and Bellevue. These two districts, as well as the Highline district, can be characterized as predominantly middle-class, with 90% or higher white populations.
- STAFF: The Project Equality staff consists of a director, an information facilitator, and a secretary.
- GOAL: The goal of Project Equality is to expand students' perceptions of occupations open to females and those open to males. The specific objectives to attain that goal have dealt primarily with the acquisition and development of media and materials that enhance the availability of choice for all students in the elementary classroom and reflect the changing definition of what "women's work" is.
- EVALUATION DESIGN: The impact of Project Equality activities upon students was assessed in 1977-78 by testing comparable groups of treatment and control students.
- MATERIALS: The staff of Project Equality have developed three sets of materials which may be used independently or in combination: occupational simulation packets, the Yellow, Blue, and Red Book, and Many Thousand Words - Work Pictures. Each set of materials is designed to provide students with nontraditional sex role models. The materials present simple, interesting, bias-free activities which demonstrate that work skills can be possessed by persons of both sexes.
- COST: The Project Equality materials are relatively low in cost and the program can easily be implemented within any K-6 curriculum. Assuming a district had 3,000 K-6 students and assuming adoption expenditures for staff development, materials and contracted services, per pupil costs would be \$2.11 in the first year and \$0.95 in subsequent years.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

- TITLE & LOCATION: Project MATCH (Matching Attitudes and Talents to Career Horizons)
Ontario-Montclair School District
Box 313
Ontario, California 91761
- TYPE: Infusion
- PROJECT DIRECTOR: Norman Steinaker
Ph.: (714) 983-7412
- SETTING: The Ontario-Montclair school district is located 40 miles east of Los Angeles in San Bernardino county. The district serves a heterogeneous community of whites, latinos, and blacks. The population is predominantly working class, with 20% of the workers holding professional or managerial positions.
- STAFF: Project MATCH operates within the framework of existing school staffing arrangements. Because it is curriculum-oriented, it does not require changes in regular staff assignments, duties, or procedures. To adopt the project, most small school districts could use their existing staff with perhaps the addition of a part-time clerical person to duplicate materials. Larger districts, however, may need to employ a part-time director to coordinate the project activities.
- GOALS: Project MATCH is designed to infuse a career education component into the regular curriculum of a K-8 school district program. Goals have been formulated in ten areas of career education, including career awareness, self-awareness, consumer competencies, and career planning and decision making.
- EVALUATION DESIGN: The evaluation design utilized pre- and posttests on intact treatment and control classes. These classes were randomly selected, one class per grade, from schools assigned to the treatment and control conditions. Student attainment of project objectives was assessed by four project-developed career education tests with established reliability and validity.
- MATERIALS: The project has developed behavioral objectives in ten areas of career education; a grade-by-grade guide to achieving these objectives; a series of curriculum infusion units (110) that integrate career education concepts into most curriculum areas; special individual programs; a simulation program in civics; and career education evaluation instruments. The project has also developed an inservice training model to introduce teachers to the project.
- COSTS: Because Project MATCH is curriculum-oriented, it does not require the addition of new staff. Accordingly, the project can be implemented with relatively little cost. The major costs are for materials, inservice training, consultation, and possibly the salary of a part-time coordinator or liaison person.